

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 10/046,657 | 01/16/2002 | William Dawson | U 013830-8 | 1050 |
| 7590 07/07/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Ladas & Parry | | | LEVY, NEIL S | |
| 26 West 61 Street New York, NY 10023 | | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMB | |
| ,, | 10025 | | 1616 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DO | CKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|
| 10/04657 |) | DAWOUN | | , |
| 1 4 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | M | gc Ce | M |
| | | ART | UNIT PAPER N | NUMBER |
| | | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | |

DATE MAILED:

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

| THE F | PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: |
|----------|---|
| a) 🔀 is | extended to run or continues to run 3 170 Nhz from the date of the final rejection |
| b) □ o | xpires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no vent however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection. |
| T | ny extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. he date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the urposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR .17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above. |
| □ ·· | llant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFB 1.192(a). cant's response to the final rejection, filed has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed accepted the application in condition for allowance: |
| | ne proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because: |
| а | . There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented. |
| ь | . They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note). |
| с | . They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note). |
| d | They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. |
| е | They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. |
| N | IOTE: |
| | |
| | |
| | lewly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. |
| | l pen the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment will be entered will not be entered and the status of the claims will be a follows: |
| C | Claims allowed: |
| | Claims objected to:Claims rejected:Claims rejected: |
| | |
| Ę | However; Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): //2 kajestrons |
| 4. Pico | The affidevit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because Application to the of scale in the standard of procedures applicant |
| | The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficent reasons why it was not earlier presented. The screaming Mycodure in the |
| A found | roposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner. |
| Other | roposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner. Not wastive as any criteria can be selected, However, Participally of the procedure of claims 38 + 39 is Not seen as abvious protocolfor reglenticidal cellulatic MERSIENT (REV. 5-89) PRIMARY EXAMINER |
| Me ve | abilious proper for rodentaidal cellulatic MESTEN |
| PTOL-303 | (REV. 5-89) PRIMARY EXAMINER |
| 32 330 | |